

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 11-13, 13, and 23-25 have been amended. Claims 1-33 are currently pending.

Claims 11-12 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action indicates that claims 11-12 and 23-25 are in an open ended form because claims 11 and 23 use the term "comprises" whereas the Office Action asserts that the term "consisting" should be used. Applicant has amended claims 11 and 23 to change the phrase "comprises at least one of" to "consists of at least one of." In addition, Applicant has amended claims 12, 24, and 25 to change the term "and" to "or". In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 11-12 and 23-25 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Windows 98 Explorer screendumps, 1998, Figures 1-8 ("Windows Explorer"). Regarding independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that "Explorer teaches a 'Views' menu for selecting one of different ways (details, and list criteria) of sorting directory strings (Fig. 1)." The Office Action further asserts that "the 'list', and 'details' sort criteria, sorts based on the textual description -- string object information – of the data files in a computer system." The Office Action further asserts that "moreover, Explorer teaches the sorting, and displaying of the directory strings through the selection of a menu selection such as 'List' selection (Fig. 2)." Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of "wherein each of the plurality of sort order criteria is based on string-object information of the string objects themselves." Support for this amendment can be found at at least page 3, line 11 to page 5, line 4 of the application as originally filed. Applicant respectfully submits that Windows Explorer fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of amended independent claim 1.

In Windows Explorer, a user can sort a file name list by file name, size, type, and modified date of the files. The Office Action appears to equate a file name list in Windows Explorer with the "string-objects" of independent claim 1. However, sorting criteria in Windows Explorer are based on information associated with the files of the file name list, and are not based on string-object information of the string objects themselves as claimed in independent

claim 1 as amended. For example, if a user of Windows Explorer only inputs some names in a list window and no other information associated with the names in the list window is input in an application, Windows Explorer can sort this list by only one criterion, that is alphabetical order. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Windows Explorer and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to include the feature of "a sorting means for responding to a sort order criteria selected from a plurality of sort order criteria by a user, wherein each of the plurality of sort order criteria is based on string-object information of the string objects themselves, retrieving a plurality of said string objects from said storage device, and sorting the plurality of said string objects based on the selected sort order criteria of the string objects." Support for this amendment can be found at at least page 3, line 11 to page 5, line 4 of the application as originally filed. For similar reasons as those discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 distinguishes over Windows Explorer and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 13 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-12 and 14-33 are dependent upon and include the features of their respective independent claims 1 and 13. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claims 1 and 13, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-12 and 14-33 also distinguish over Windows Explorer and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 13 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael W. Maddox
Michael W. Maddox

Registration No.: 47,764
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant